

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 27-45 are pending in the application. Claims 27, 32, 36, 41, and 42 have been amended. Claims 1-26 were previously cancelled. Applicant believes that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Supervisory Examiner Quang Nguyen and Examiner Kristie D. Shingles are thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives (Mr. Ali and Ms. Chotani) during an in-person interview conducted on October 10, 2007. A summary of the substance of the Interview was provided by Examiner Shingles. See 10/10/1007 Interview Summary. Based on the Examiner's suggestions, independent claims 27, 32, 36, and 42 have been amended to further clarify the pre-association between a given exercise and one or more virtual machines.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 27-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,988,138 to Alcorn et al. ("Alcorn") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0103882 to Johnston et al. ("Johnston"). Applicant traverses this rejection for *at least* the reason that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, none of the references relied upon, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features of "storing in a course database course information including a list of exercises, and for a given exercise one or more virtual machines associated with the exercise"; "accessing the course database to determine at least one virtual machine associated with the selected exercise"; and "launching the virtual machine associated with the selected exercise...", as recited in independent claim 27, for example. Independent claims 32, 36, and 42 recite similar elements.

The Examiner, during the Interview of October 10, 2007, acknowledged that neither Alcorn nor Johnston teach or suggest a pre-association between a given exercise and one or more virtual machines. Applicant amended claims 27, 32, 36, and 42 to positively recite a course database *storing* course information including a list of exercises, and *for a given exercise one or more virtual machines associated with the exercise*. Thus, the given exercise and one or more virtual machines are *pre-associated* in a course database, such that when a user wishes to perform the given exercise, the course database is accessed to determine at least one virtual machine that is *associated* with the exercise, and this *associated* virtual machine is launched.

Moreover, the Examiner admits at page 4 of the Office Action, that Alcorn fails to teach accessing the course database to determine at least one virtual machine associated with the selected exercise; and launching the virtual machine associated with the selected exercise. The Examiner relies on Johnston for these features. In Johnston, however, when a user wishes to perform an exercise during a session, a dynamic learning unit (DLU) that has appropriate processing capacity to run the session is identified, and the identified DLU starts virtual machines for the exercise (See at least paragraphs 44, 45 and 65 of Johnston). First, Johnston fails to teach or suggest a course database *storing*, for a given exercise one or more virtual machines *associated* with the exercise. In fact, the identification of the DLU and the starting of virtual machines at the DLU are performed based on *processing capacity* of the DLU, and not on a *pre-existing association* between the exercise and the virtual machines. Moreover, Johnston fails to teach or suggest *accessing the course database* to determine at least one virtual machine *associated* with a selected exercise and *launching the associated virtual machine*.

Since, Alcorn and Johnston, either alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest, at least the above-mentioned features of Applicant's independent claim 27, claim 27 is allowable. Claims 32, 36, and 42 include features similar to those set forth in claim 27. Thus, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons given relative to claim 27. Thus the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 28-31, 33-35, 37-41, and 43-45 depend from and add features to one of claims 27, 32, 36, and 42, rejections of these claims are likewise improper and should be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: October 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:  32,694
Nidhi Chotani
Registration No. 59,924

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Direct: 703-770-7529
Fax: 703-770-7901